

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of

**Technology Transitions Policy Task Force
Seeks Comment on Potential Trials**

)
)
)
)

PS Docket No. 13-5

**INITIAL COMMENTS OF THE
BEXAR METRO 9-1-1 NETWORK DISTRICT
TO THE PUBLIC NOTICE**

A.	Summary of Comment.....	2
B.	Commission trial on expected or required documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 interconnection type transition aspects would create a factual record for the Commission and interested stakeholders that may potentially help to accelerate future successful transitioning on these types of issues.....	3
C.	Because the Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network's NG9-1-1 deployment will be addressing documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 "interconnection" type transition aspects, doing such concurrently in the context of Commission trial may be helpful on these types of issues.....	10
D.	Conclusion	16

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of

**Technology Transitions Policy Task Force
Seeks Comment on Potential Trials**

)
)
)
)

PS Docket No. 13-5

**INITIAL COMMENTS OF THE
BEXAR METRO 9-1-1 NETWORK DISTRICT
TO THE PUBLIC NOTICE**

The Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District (“Bexar Metro”)¹ respectfully submits the following initial comments to the Federal Communications Commission (the “Commission”) Technology Transitions Policy Task Force (“Task Force”) Public Notice seeking comments on potential real-world trials to obtain data that will be helpful to the Commission.²

A. Summary of Comment

A real-world trial on expected or required documentation for certain Next Generation 9-1-1 interconnection type transition aspects may potentially help the Commission and interested stakeholders to accelerate future successful transitioning on these interconnection types of issues. Because Bexar Metro’s NG9-1-1 deployment will be addressing documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 interconnection type transition aspects, Bexar Metro is interested in doing such concurrently in the context of Commission trial. Accordingly, if it would be helpful to the Commission, Bexar Metro volunteers its area, its Emergency Services Internet Protocol Network

¹ Bexar Metro is a special purpose Emergency Communication District created pursuant to TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE Chapter 772, Subchapter D, and is the 9-1-1 administrative entity that covers Bexar, Guadalupe, and Comal Counties in Texas. Bexar Metro also holds Certificate No. 60905 from the Public Utility Commission of Texas to provide its own legacy 9-1-1 database service, but to date Bexar Metro has not deployed its own legacy 9-1-1 database.

² *In the Matter Technology Transitions Policy Task Force seeks Comment on Potential Trials*, DA 13-1016, GN Docket No. 13-5 (rel. May 10, 2013) (“Public Notice”).

("ESInet"), and a reasonable amount of its resources for a NG9-1-1 real-world trial on NG9-1-1 certain interconnection type aspects to identify factual issues associated with these potentially important technical and policy questions and, if possible, resolve them with interested stakeholders. Bexar Metro expects, subject to resource conditions, that the following other interested stakeholders are willing to work with Bexar Metro, if it were to be selected by the Commission as a NG9-1-1 trial area: Time Warner Cable, Intrado, Redsky, AT&T, Level 3, and TCS. In addition, Bexar Metro has reached out to other interested stakeholders, and Bexar Metro would work with any other interested stakeholders identified by the Commission for such trial.

B. Commission trial on expected or required documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 interconnection type transition aspects would create a factual record for the Commission and interested stakeholders that may potentially help to accelerate future successful transitioning on these types of issues.

The Commission seeks comment on trials involving emerging all-Internet Protocol ("IP") networks that "will assist the Commission, state, local, and Tribal governments, and Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) in a few geographic areas to answer important technical and policy questions to accelerate the transition"³ (i.e., "transitions from copper to fiber, from wireline to wireless, and from time-division multiplexing (TDM) to IP").⁴ Specifically in the context of the scope and process for NG9-1-1 trials, the Public Notice provides in relevant parts:

Given that reliable 911 service is critical to public safety, we seek comment on a possible trial that would deploy an "all-IP" NG911 service on an accelerated basis in a number of geographic areas where public safety authorities are ready to deploy NG911 for one or more PSAPs. ... How long does it take to transition from a TDM-based to an IP-based architecture? Where and how are 911 calls to be handed off to the ESInet, whether by ILECs or other providers, such as CMRS, interconnected VoIP, interconnected text and telematics services? Are there state or Commission rules that accelerate or delay the conversion from E911 to

³ Public Notice at p. 2.

⁴ *Id.* at p. 1.

NG911? Are there steps that regulators can take to speed the transition to NG911 and/or minimize the expense? We seek comment on the technical and process issues that should be covered by a trial and on how best to structure a trial to gather data on these issues.

...

We seek comment on the process for identifying such areas. Trial participants would also make caller location available through NG911 mechanisms, including the Location Information Server (LIS). We seek comment on candidate PSAPs or regions, the selection of participating carriers, and whether trials should take place in areas where calls are delivered via VoIP or also via legacy network gateways.

...

Any trial of this kind should provide data on both the challenges of transitioning from E911 to NG911 and the operational performance characteristics of NG911 call handling. Thus, we propose that participants in the trial document the design and conversion process, including effort and time required, and gather data on call handling performance, interoperability issues, location accuracy, and any system failures related to call or location delivery (Footnotes in original omitted).⁵

Overarching many of the Commission's questions and these matters is recognizing that in the context of NG9-1-1, a major remaining potential roadblock is not purely technical, operational, or financial. Rather, a major remaining potential roadblock is that the NG9-1-1 legal and regulatory framework for interconnection type transition aspects is uncertain, or at minimum at least very debatable.

Historically, 9-1-1 "interconnection" access has been addressed differently based on the type of technology of the connecting service provider and the legal status of the service provider of the E9-1-1 Selective Routing network. For example, 47 U.S.C. Section 251, entitled "Interconnection," has different subsections applicable to only all telecommunications providers, which is subsection (a); applicable to only all local exchange companies, which is subsection (b); and applicable to only incumbent local exchange carriers, which is subsection (c). But in the context of NG9-1-1, the service provider seeking interconnection may arguably not be subject to any these subsections, and the service provider with whom interconnection is being sought may

⁵ *Id.* at pp. 7-8.

not be subject to any of these subsections. Moreover, some agreements associated with “interconnection” with incumbent local exchange carriers subject to subsection (c) must be filed with state public utility commissions (“state PUCs”), but such is not the case for other entities. Similarly, in addition to the potential confusion and question on the application of section 251 under federal law, some state laws may have similar legal and regulatory framework NG9-1-1 interconnection type aspects that are uncertain, or at minimum debatable.

Assuming that there are no technical or operational issues in dispute, a major remaining potential roadblock in NG9-1-1 deployment transitioning is whether interconnection issues will begin and be completed once all the regulatory and legal people have been added to the deployment transition discussions. For example, Level 3 explained details on some of these issues to the Commission in a filing more than two years ago, which provided in relevant parts (footnotes in original omitted):

In the past, Level 3 has cooperated with requests from another carrier to migrate end user customers to alternative facilities or a new route, and the migration has entailed the expenditure of considerable effort and resources, and has taken months to complete. When Level 3 has moved traffic in response to such a request, the requesting carrier has compensated Level 3 for these costs. Past experience has shown that the new entrants into the competitive selective router arena are unwilling to do that. Migrating customers to another SR or NG911 Carrier is a large scope project that requires a minimum of six months to execute.⁶

...

If an NG911 Carrier is permitted to become the sole provider of service to PSAPs, it should be subject to the same restriction on levying costs on other carrier as the ILEC or other entities that control “bottleneck facilities.” ... The Commission has recognized this issue and in appropriate circumstances has not reserved price and access restrictions to the ILECs. It has given the same treatment to other entities that have exclusive control of “bottleneck facilities” or customers that other carriers have no choice but to use in order to reach those customers. For example, in the *CLEC Access Charge Order*, the Commission determined that CLECs have exclusive control over access to the end users they serve and

⁶ *In the Matter of Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment*, PS Docket No. 10-255, Notice of Inquiry, Level 3 Comments at p. 12 (Mar. 2, 2011) (“Level 3 Comments”).

interexchange carriers (“IXCs”) have no choice but to use the network and facilities of the CLEC in order to reach those customers.⁷

...

As is the case for other monopoly providers, the agreement between a NG911 Carrier and the PSAPs should be a matter of public record. Only by making the terms of a NG911 Carrier’s exclusive arrangements with PSAPs public can the Commission ensure that the agreements are reasonable, in the public interest and do not discriminate against interconnected carriers whose customers must be able to reach those PSAPs served on an exclusive basis NG911 Carrier..⁸

...

The fact-specific, circumstance-dependent nature of migration further justifies the use of commercial arrangements between a competitive 911 provider, such as a NG911 Carrier, and the carriers with whom that provider interconnects, and militates against a one-size-fits-all mandatory interconnection regime such as that proposed by NG911 Carrier.⁹

...

If the Commission declines to allow interconnection for competitive 911 providers through commercial agreements and instead determines that interconnection and end user migration should take place in a regulated environment through Commission rules, the Commission should establish clear guidelines on the timing, obligations and testing processes of all carriers involved in an SR migration.¹⁰

...

Any migration of customers from one SR to another should take place pursuant to an executed agreement with NG911 Carrier and the PSAP, subject to dispute before this Commission.¹¹

Whether one agrees or disagrees with the points explained by Level 3 (some of which appear to be reasonably valid concerns), or whether one needs a further detailed factual record on some or all of these issues before having opinions, the Level 3 Comments accurately demonstrate that the regulatory and legal people have been added to the deployment transition discussions; that there are NG9-1-1 interconnection documentation and processes that are uncertain, or at minimum at

⁷ *Id.* at pp. 16-17.

⁸ *Id.* at p. 18.

⁹ *Id.* at p. 19.

¹⁰ *Id.* at p. 20.

¹¹ *Id.*

least very debatable, and these are ripe for consideration, a factual record, and policymaker decisions.

To date, the documentation and processes issues seem to come up and can be summarized around the following six basic scenarios: (1) as accurately pointed out by Level 3, these issues may arise when the 9-1-1 authority wants service providers to connect directly or indirectly to NG9-1-1 instead of connecting to the legacy SR; (2) issues may arise when a service provider seeks to connect directly or indirectly via Session Initial Protocol (SIP) instead of connecting via TDM; (3) issues may arise on how subsections of section 251 or other federal and state regulations related to wholesale and/or retail 9-1-1 services may apply to ILECs, CLECs, governmental entities, and third-parties associated with the NG9-1-1 deployment transition; (4) issues may arise on what type of negotiations, basic agreement terms, timelines, testing, and additional documentation are needed between some or all of the involved stakeholders (*e.g.*, interconnection agreements, commercial agreements, guidebooks; specific agreement clauses on indemnities, hold harmless, force majeure, dispute resolution, arbitration, etc.); (5) issues may arise concerning under what conditions service providers will be establishing a LIS and sending location information as part of 9-1-1 call delivery, and when regions and/or states will have a sufficiently large enough number of NG9-1-1 deployments for such to become the reasonable provisioning expectation; and (6) issues may arise when interested stakeholders desiring to transition from the legacy SR to NG9-1-1 or to handle direct or indirect SIP 9-1-1 communications to NG9-1-1 want to determine how to prudently proceed given the first five items.

Irrespective of whether subsections of 251(a), (b), &(c) apply, or can apply, to some or all NG9-1-1 interconnection type issues, subsections 251(a), (b), &(c) may still all be insufficient

in the competitive real-world of NG9-1-1 environment. Service providers for some or all NG9-1-1 deployments may not be telecommunications carriers subject to subsection 251(a); local exchange carriers (“LEC”) subject to subsection 251(b); and/or incumbent local exchange carriers (“ILECs”) subject to subsection 251(c). Similarly, as the Commission has recently pointed out in its report to Congress, the question of which aspects of NG9-1-1 are primarily subject to the Commission’s interstate federal jurisdiction, are primarily subject to state public utility commission jurisdiction, and cases where there is need of a new federal regulatory “backstop” are currently unsettled and unclear matters.¹²

In today’s 9-1-1 access provisioning environment, a CLEC subject to subsection 251(b) may be providing access to 9-1-1 for a wireless carrier subject to subsection 251(a) and for a VoIP provider that may not be subject to subsections 251(a),(b),&(c) or subject to direct or indirect regulation by state public utility commissions. Level 3 is one example of this situation: Level 3 is a CLEC with state PUC certificates, but Level 3 provides access to 9-1-1 for wireless carriers (e.g., T-Mobile) and for VoIP providers.¹³ In Level 3’s capacity of providing access to 9-1-1, is what Level 3 is doing subject to subsection 251(b) because Level 3 is a CLEC, subject to subsection 251(a) and the Commission’s authority over commercial mobile radio service (“CMRS”) because T-Mobile is a wireless carrier, or subject to the NET 911 Act but not subsections 251(a), (b), &(c) for the VoIP service aspects? But going forward in the context of NG9-1-1 interconnection, should it really matter and be a material factor for wireline, wireless, VoIP, and/or hybrid services when they all must have access to 9-1-1, and, if so, why?

¹² *Legal and Regulatory Framework for Next Generation 911 Services Report to Congress*, at 4.1.2.2(2), February 22, 2013 (available at <http://www.fcc.gov/document/legal-and-regulatory-framework-ng911-services-report-congress>) (“Legal and Regulatory Framework Report”) (Congress should consider enacting legislation “creating a federal regulatory ‘backstop’ to ensure that there is no gap between federal and state authority (or the exercise thereof) over NG911.”).

¹³ See, <http://www.level3.com/en/solutions/industry/wholesale/wireless-operators/>

In the Public Notice, the Commission recognizes that the appropriate general policy framework for IP interconnection is an area of ongoing debate within the industry.¹⁴ In the context of NG9-1-1, however, the Commission continues to recognize that 9-1-1 may be different and distinguishable from such other policy matters, because it involves the Communications Act's "purpose of promoting safety of life and property." As the Commission recently explained (footnotes in original omitted):

139. We interpret these 911 statutes together as recognizing and adding to the Commission's long-standing authority under the Communications Act to ensure that consumers using advanced communications technologies have the ability to reach 911 and, as part of that authority, to ensure that consumers sending these transmissions receive a notification that their attempt to reach 911 did not succeed. Even if these statutes do not directly authorize the FCC to impose 911 requirements on providers of interconnected text messaging, we find that in this limited context—that is, where a text messaging provider offers consumers the ability to send and receive messages from all or substantially all text-capable U.S. telephone numbers and enables those consumers, as part of the functionality being provided, to rely *on spectrum* for the transmission of those messages—our decision to require the provision of a bounce-back message is reasonably ancillary to the effective performance of our statutorily mandated responsibilities. Due in part to the types of specific forms of consumer confusion discussed above, we find that we could not fully realize our statutory 911 responsibilities to ensure that consumers using advanced services can reach 911 if consumers do not view a text to 911 as a reliable means of either reaching 911 or finding out that their text was not received, which will then allow them to use appropriate means for reaching help.

140. We emphasize again the important limits and context in which we exercise our statutory authority today. The above-discussed exercise of our substantive grants of authority is conditioned and limited by the Communications Act's "purpose of promoting safety of life and property." This is a situation in which a narrow set of rules help to save lives. In a similar context, Judge Kavanaugh emphasized in his concurrence in *Nuvio*, which upheld our interconnected VoIP E911 rules, that "the FCC possesses the statutory authority, which the Commission may reasonably choose to exercise, to address the public safety threat" posed by a lack of access to 911 by "ensur[ing] adequate 911 connections" for consumers using interconnected VoIP, which is an offering not classified as a telecommunications service. Judge Kavanaugh's opinion relied on Congress's instructions to the FCC, under the 911 Act of 1999, ENHANCE 911 Act, and

¹⁴ Public Notice at p. 4 and footnote 17.

other statutory provisions. We thus conclude that our decision to apply the bounce-back rules to providers of interconnected text messaging is a narrow one that is consistent with our earlier, limited use of ancillary authority to ensure reasonable access to 911.¹⁵

Accordingly and recognizing that NG9-1-1 interconnection may be different and distinguishable from such other Commission policy matters, spending many years and material resources arguing before the Commission and state PUCs about what is the expected or required legal and regulatory framework for NG9-1-1 interconnection is not going to accelerate transition.

But if the Commission and interested stakeholders in good faith can work these NG9-1-1 interconnection issues in a Commission trial, then perhaps such may accomplish expected or required documentation and processes that are reasonable, nondiscriminatory, competitively fair, and coherent, that accelerate successful transition, and protect the public. For these reasons, the Bexar Metro urges the Commission to address these types of NG9-1-1 interconnection issues in a Commission trial.

C. Because the Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network's NG9-1-1 deployment will be addressing documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 "interconnection" type transition aspects, doing such concurrently in the context of Commission trial may be helpful on these types of issues.

In addition to the NG9-1-1 interconnection explained by Level 3 as noted previously in these comments, earlier in 2013 the Commission provided a report to Congress on the Legal and Regulatory Framework for NG9-1-1 Services recommending, among other things that:

- Congress should encourage and set a goal for the early deployment of state or regional ESInets.
- Congress should consider incentives for states to revise their liability regimes to provide appropriate protection for entities providing or supporting NG911 services, in conformance with standardized guidelines or model state legislation.

¹⁵ *In the Matter of Facilitating the Development of Text-to-911 and Other Next Generation 911 Applications*, PS Docket No. 11-153; and *In the Matter of Framework for Next Generation 911 Deployment*, PS Docket No. 10-255, Order, FCC 13-64 (rel. May 17, 2013).

- Congress should encourage state adoption of an expanded and uniform definition of entities that may obtain certification to act as NG911 System Service Providers.
- Congress should encourage states to modify or eliminate legacy routing regulations and adopt a technology-neutral approach to routing of NG911 traffic.
- To address instances where states lack authority under state law to regulate certain elements of NG911 service or otherwise choose not to exercise such authority, Congress should consider enacting legislation creating a federal regulatory “backstop” to ensure that there is no gap between federal and state authority (or the exercise thereof) over NG911.¹⁶

Bexar Metro will briefly address the five items above from the Commission Report to Congress, and then Bexar Metro will provide specific detail on how its NG9-1-1 Agreement is relevant to these issues and additional background detail on Bexar Metro.

First, Bexar Metro’s NG9-1-1 deployment is consistent with the goal to encourage early deployment of state or regional ESInets. Second, Texas law has been amended by HB 1972 to clarify, effective September 1, 2013, that its liability protections are broad and not limited to solely telecommunications providers.¹⁷ Third, Bexar Metro, as noted earlier, holds a certificate from the Public Utility Commission of Texas (“Texas PUC”) to provide its own legacy 9-1-1 database services¹⁸ (although to date Bexar Metro has not deployed its own legacy 9-1-1 database). Fourth, the Texas PUC has modified its substantive rules for a competitive 9-1-1 environment via ILEC unbundling¹⁹ and by attempting to clarify some matters to facilitate

¹⁶ Legal and Regulatory Framework Report.

¹⁷ TEX. H.B. 1972, 83d Leg. R.S. (2013)
(available at <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/BillLookup/Text.aspx?LegSess=83R&Bill=HB1972>).

¹⁸ See,
http://www.puc.texas.gov/industry/communications/directories/clec/report_clec.aspx?ID=CLSQL01DB1245627400001

¹⁹ P.U.C. SUBST. R. 26.433(h) (“Unbundling. A dominant CTU that is a 9-1-1 network services provider and a 9-1-1 database management services provider, if it has not already done so prior to the effective date of this section, must file within 90 days from the effective date of this section an alternative 9-1-1

enabling NG9-1-1 migration, while balancing concerns on potential material cost shifting to the industry.²⁰ Fifth, the issue of needing a regulatory “backstop” could be developed more as part of a Commission trial, if needed, should resolution of issues not be fully accomplished amicably.

Specifically relevant to the TDM-to-IP NG9-1-1 migration issues, legacy SR to NG9-1-1 migration issues, and some of the other issues explained by Level 3 and discussed earlier in these comments, the Bexar Metro NG9-1-1 Agreement provides, respectively:

This Ninth Amendment (hereinafter “Amendment”) provides for the installation of an Emergency Services IP Network (hereinafter “ESInet”). The ESInet will receive 9-1-1 and other specified emergency calls and requests in **TDM and SIP from all applicable service providers**, selective router legacy networks, and/or ESInets, as directed by Customer, and route 9-1-1 and other specified emergency calls and requests to Customer PSAPs in the manner described in Exhibit D, “Emergency Services IP-Based ESInet, Network, and Host/Remote Equipment Requirements and Functionality Statement of Work” dated May 7, 2010.

...

8. Connections to Service Providers. **Company shall communicate with service providers or other entities authorized by Customer seeking to deliver emergency calls and requests to the ESInet, in order to provide interface information conducive to the service provider establishing such connections. Connections will be accommodated by the Company at rates no higher than generally customary, and consistent with reasonable policies and practices of the Company given the context of the emergency services being provided.**

(Emphasis added)

tariff that provides 9-1-1 administrative entities the option to purchase any separately offered and priced 9-1-1 service.”)

(available at <http://www.puc.texas.gov/agency/rulesnlaws/subrules/telecom/26.433/26.433.pdf>.)

²⁰ P.U.C. SUBST. R. 26.433(i) (“Migration of 9-1-1 Service. Unless otherwise determined by the commission, nothing in this rule, any interconnection agreement, or any commercial agreement may be interpreted to impair a 9-1-1 administrative entity’s authority to migrate to newer functionally equivalent IP-based 9-1-1 systems and/or NG9-1-1 systems, or to require the removal of unnecessary direct 9-1-1 dedicated trunks, circuits, databases, or functions ... Paragraph (1) of this subsection is intended to promote and ensure collaboration so that 9-1-1 service architecture and provisioning modernization can proceed expeditiously for the benefit of improvements in the delivery of 9-1-1 emergency services. Paragraph (1) of this subsection is not intended to require or authorize a 9-1-1 administrative entity’s rate center service plan specifications or a 9-1-1 network architecture deviation that causes new, material cost shifting between telecommunications providers or between telecommunications providers and 9-1-1 administrative entities. Examples of such a deviation would be points of interconnection different from current LATA configurations and requiring provisioning of the 9-1-1 network with a similar type deviation that may involve new material burdens on competition or the public interest.) (available at <http://www.puc.texas.gov/agency/rulesnlaws/subrules/telecom/26.433/26.433.pdf>.)

Under the Bexar Metro NG9-1-1 Agreement, if a service provider is ready to begin processes to connect via IP to the NG9-1-1, then the NG9-1-1 provider will do so. Under the Bexar Metro NG9-1-1 Agreement, if a service provider wants to begin the process to connect to NG9-1-1 knowing that the service provider will be accommodated at connections at rates no higher than generally customary and under reasonable policies and practices given the context of the emergency services, then the NG9-1-1 provider will do so. Whether the NG9-1-1 provider is doing such pursuant to subsections 251(a), (b), & (c), pursuant to the NET 9-1-1 Act, and/or pursuant to contractual reasons should be largely irrelevant -- because ultimately the NG9-1-1 interconnection is and should be done in the same reasonable, competitively fair, and technologically neutral manner.

Bexar Metro is a special purpose Emergency Communication District created pursuant to TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE Chapter 772, Subchapter D, and is the 9-1-1 administrative entity that covers Bexar, Guadalupe, and Comal Counties in Texas. Bexar Metro covers an approximate population of 1.9 million people, which exceeds the population of approximately fifteen states and would be a sufficiently large enough trial area to gather meaningful factual data on issues.²¹ The Texas Emergency Response System in Bexar Metro's area has two general separate, yet equally important components: (1) the 9-1-1 administrative entity to provide the delivery of emergency requests and (2) the municipality, county, or federal military facility that dispatches and renders the specifically required emergency service. This general separation of "call delivery" and "service delivery" responsibility enables the two technically different and challenging professions to complement each other, while they are seeking to provide people responses to their emergencies. To successfully accomplish its mission, Bexar Metro must,

²¹ See, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_U.S._states_and_territories_by_population.

among other things, deploy and manage a technology neutral network that routes 9-1-1 emergency requests to the appropriate answering and responding jurisdiction, Bexar Metro must create and maintain a highly accurate database that displays location information, and Bexar Metro must construct, deploy, and maintain a spatially accurate geographic digital map to support location determination technologies and enhance computer aided dispatch.

Bexar Metro has been working for many years in planning its NG9-1-1 deployment. Bexar Metro has deployed ESInet network infrastructure. In August 2012, Bexar Metro entered into a five-year agreement from the date of final acceptance with AT&T for the NG9-1-1 component. On August 20, 2012 AT&T provided a Notice of Network Change, and on March 13, 2013, the Commission issued a Public Notice indicating that upon initial review the filing appears complete.²² The Bexar Metro NG9-1-1 Agreement with AT&T is in excess of 175 pages and is a public document, except for a one page network diagram that is confidential for network security reasons.²³

Because of Bexar Metro's ongoing NG9-1-1 transition and to accept the deployed network with the confidence of knowing that it meets the required commitments and the reasonable expectations of all interested stakeholders, Bexar Metro seeks to identify any issues that interested stakeholders may have and, if possible, amicably work through and resolve such issues. Interested service providers have an excellent opportunity here to move forward cooperatively towards IP connection to NG9-1-1 and to raise, explain, and change at the outset any matter they view as not being consistent with customary rates and reasonable policies and practices on connecting to NG9-1-1. Bexar Metro's technical, operational, and regulatory staff

²² Available at http://transition.fcc.gov/Daily_Releases/Daily_Business/2013/db0314/DOC-319500A1.pdf

²³ The Bexar Metro agreement with AT&T is available to interested parties upon request, with the exception of the one page confidential network diagram for security purposes.

members have substantial experience in their respective areas; they are active in NENA and other industry 9-1-1 matters; and they work closely with others in Texas and with industry stakeholders. Bexar Metro expects to work cooperatively with, subject to resource conditions, the following other interested stakeholders are willing to work with Bexar Metro if it were to be selected by the Commission as a NG9-1-1 trial area: Time Warner Cable, Intrado, Redsky, AT&T, Level 3, and TCS. In addition, Bexar Metro has reached out to other interested stakeholders, and Bexar Metro would work with any other interested stakeholders identified by the Commission.

Accordingly, because Bexar Metro's NG9-1-1 deployment will be addressing documentation and processes for certain NG9-1-1 interconnection type transition aspects, Bexar Metro is interested in doing such concurrently in the context of Commission trial. If it would be helpful to the Commission, Bexar Metro volunteers its area, its ESINet, and a reasonable amount of its resources for a NG9-1-1 real-world trial to work with the Commission and interested stakeholders on a trial to identify interconnection issues associated with NG9-1-1 deployment and, if possible, resolve such issues amicably in the context of a Commission trial.

D. Conclusion

The Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District appreciates the opportunity to provide these initial comments, and respectfully request that the Commission take action consistent with these initial comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard A. Muscat

Richard A. Muscat
Director of Regulatory Affairs
Bexar Metro 9-1-1 Network District
911 Saddletree Court
San Antonio, Texas 78231
(210) 408-3911 (voice)
(210) 408-3912 (fax)
Regulatory@bexarmetro.org

*with permission
RP*

July 8, 2013